

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in the present application and are rejected.

Applicants' Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Grabow** (U.S. Patent No. 4,702,153) in view of **Deutsch** (U.S. Patent No. 5,351,337). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action argues that **Grabow** discloses a galley for use in an airplane, but does not disclose water heater hookups. It is further argued that it would have been obvious to add the specific arrangement of water heater lines in **Deutsch** to the galley of **Grabow**.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of **Grabow** and **Deutsch** is improper. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that “both are shown in the art to be useable together.” See page 2, lines 14-15. This is insufficient for a proper combination of references. According to MPEP § 2143.01:

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. (emphasis added)

Grabow contains no disclosure or suggestion of a hot water system of any kind. **Grabow** is directed at a system for venting air in an airplane kitchen. Although **Grabow** discloses a sink, there is no discussion of the desirability of adding a hot water tank, hot water heater, hot water supply line, or hot water tap of any kind. One having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to look to other art in order to add a hot water system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Even if the combination of the references was proper, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established prima facie obviousness. **Deutsch** discloses a pressurized water delivery system which delivers both hot and cold water. **Deutsch** does not contain disclosure of several elements of the claimed invention which **Grabow** lacks. For instance, it contains no disclosure or suggestion of an electric instantaneous water heater adjacent to the hot-water tank or of a control unit for controlling electric power supplied to the various heaters of the system as recited in claim 1. With regard to claim 2, **Deutsch** also contains no disclosure of a recycling pipe for returning hot water to the tank. Therefore, Applicants respectfully argue in the alternative that prima facie obviousness has not been established.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed invention distinguishes over the cited art. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action would be desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Stephen G. Adrian

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,878

SGA/RBC/ya
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 822-1100